

**REMARKS**

This is supplemental to the Amendment filed January 30, 2009. Applicants assume that the amendments made in the January 30<sup>th</sup> Amendment have been entered.

Claims 1 and 3-26 are all the claims pending in the application. By this Supplemental Amendment, Applicants cancel claims 27-29 without prejudice or disclaimer.

***Statement of Substance of Interview***

As an initial matter, Applicants thank the Examiner and the SPE for the courtesies extended during the interview conducted on February 5, 2009. In view of the helpful comments provided by the Examiner and the SPE during the interview, and to expedite prosecution of the instant application, claims 1, 9, and 13 have been amended to include the features of claims 27, 28, and 29, respectively. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments place the application in immediate condition for allowance, as discussed in further detail below with respect to the prior art rejection of the claims and as preliminarily agreed to by the Examiner and SPE subject to further consideration and/or search (*see also* Interview Summary).

It is respectfully submitted that the instant STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW complies with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §§1.2 and 1.133 and MPEP §713.04.

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 1, 3, 9, 13, and 17-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,622,682 to Kumakura in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,771,896 to Tamura *et al.* ("Tamura"). Claims 4, 5, 10, and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as

SUPPLEMENTAL AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 AND  
STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

Application No.: 10/808,461

Attorney Docket No.: Q80447

allegedly being unpatentable over Kumakura in view of Tamura, and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0150840 to Farrell *et al.* ("Farrell"). Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kumakura in view of Tamura and Farrell, and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0140963 to Otsuka. Claims 8, 11, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kumakura in view of Tamura and Farrell, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,999,113 to Omura.

For *at least* the following reasons, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As noted above, claims 1, 9, and 13 have been amended to include the features of claims 27, 28, and 29, respectively, to expedite prosecution. As submitted in the January 30<sup>th</sup> Amendment, the combined teachings of Tamura and Kumakura do not teach or suggest the features recited in claims 27-29 (see January 30<sup>th</sup> Amendment, page 12). For the Examiner's convenience, Applicants reproduce below the previously submitted arguments.

Claims 1, 9, and 13 recite, in some variation that the first communication means is automatically turned off after said predetermined data segment is transferred from said printer controlling device to said printer, and said first communication means remains turned off while the other data segment is being transferred from said printer controlling device to said printer using said second communication means. This feature is not even remotely suggested by the combination of Tamura and Kumakura. For instance, Tamura does not teach more than one communication means between two communicating devices, let alone teach that one communication means is turned off while the other one is operating. As noted in the Interview Summary, the Examiner and SPE also agree that Tamura and Kumakura do not teach this feature.

SUPPLEMENTAL AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 AND  
STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW  
Application No.: 10/808,461  
Attorney Docket No.: Q80447

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 1, 9, and 13.

Claims 3 and 17-26 are patentable *at least* by virtue of their dependency.

Claims 4, 5, 10, and 14-16 depend from claims 1, 9, or 13. Since Farrell does not cure the deficient teachings of Kumakura and Tamura with respect to claims 1, 9, or 13, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 4, 5, 10, and 14-16 are patentable *at least* by virtue of their dependency.

Claims 6 and 7 depend from claim 1. Since Otsuka does not cure the deficient teachings of Kumakura and Tamura with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 6 and 7 are patentable *at least* by virtue of their dependency.

Claims 8, 11, and 12 depend from claims 1 or 9. Since Omura does not cure the deficient teachings of Kumakura and Tamura with respect to claims 1 and 9, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 8, 11 and 12 are patentable *at least* by virtue of their dependency.

Since claim 27 has been canceled, the rejection thereto is rendered moot.

***Conclusion***

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

SUPPLEMENTAL AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 AND  
STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

Application No.: 10/808,461

Attorney Docket No.: Q80447

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 17, 2009

/Quadeer A. Ahmed/  
Quadeer A. Ahmed  
Registration No. 60,835